FURS:
THE CONTROVERSY HEATS UP

WILD HORSES: STRUGGLING FOR SURVIVAL
DOG AND CAT THEFT RINGS
PET FOOD COMPANIES: FRIENDS OR FOES?
THE AMERICAN HUNTING MYTH

How hunter-dominated state and federal wildlife agencies are systematically destroying America's wildlife and natural lands and what you can do to help restructure these agencies and insure a responsible stewardship over America's wildlife.

Every day in North America more than half a million wild animals are killed as a result of the combined efforts of recreational hunters, state and federal wildlife managers, and "amateur" shooters. Ten of thousands of other animals are wounded or crippled by bullets or arrows or are maimed by steel traps or suffer slow deaths from poisoning. Hunters and government wildlife officials call these enterprises "wildlife management," but many naturalists and ecologists, including Ron Baker, consider these practices cruel and irresponsible.

In his book The American Hunting Myth, Baker examines the so-called "sport" of hunting and the destructive system that state and federal wildlife agencies use to perpetuate it. One by one, he convincingly refutes the arguments that hunters and wildlife officials use to defend recreational hunting. He graphically illustrates how greed for more hunting by state game bureaus results in environmentally destructive practices; how politicians on both the state and federal levels use their influence to expand public hunting; how traditional beliefs about nature are partly responsible for the nonecological educations received by college and university students who train to become wildlife biologists and wildlife managers and how this training ensures that land and wildlife management practices; how game management creates artificial "surprises" of hunted species, which often exist to the detriment of songbirds and endangered wildlife; how controlled hunting often increases deer starvation; how the killing of so-called "nuisance" animals is destructive to species and ecosystems; how many species that are rare, threatened, or endangered are illegally killed by American hunters; how the current system of managing wildlife has been a biological, ecological, and social disaster; and how a significant percentage of hunters oppose a wilderness ethic; how denuding citizens unintentionally support the hunting lobby with their money; how hunting results in innumerable violations of nonhunters' constitutional rights; how hunting often helps to foster an insensitivity to life that sometimes results in violence and criminality; why real reasons why people hunt; how hunting could be phased out in favor of sound wildlife management practices; and finally, what you can do to help end the carnage and ensure a humane stewardship over America's wildlife.

The American Hunting Myth is not a chronicle of sentimentalized hunter stories. It is an unemotional and meticulously researched work. It is both a vehicle that points the way to reform and a plea for the development of an environmental ethic before time runs out for wildlife and ourselves.

"Baker builds a strong case for the abolition of recreational hunting. This is a much needed book."


THE AMERICAN HUNTING MYTH
by Ron Baker $10.95 (275 pages, hardcover)

About the Author

Ron Baker has had an intense interest in the outdoors that has spanned most of his forty-two years. A serious student of wildlife for most of his adult life, he began crusading for animals and the environment during the late 1960s. Among his many other projects, he campaigned in Vermont for the curtailment of snowmobile and ORV use in that state's wilderness areas. In rural Massachusetts, he helped to plan legal action to halt construction of both a highway and a pipeline, each of which would have destroyed thousands of acres of natural lands. He is the former editor and publisher of the Boston Journal, a nature-appreciation quarterly, and a frequent contributor to Agenda, the monthly magazine of the Animal Rights Network. He is an active member of several animal protection and environmental organizations and serves as vice-president of the White Plains (N.Y.)-based, 2,000-member Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting. He lives with his wife in a log cabin in the Adirondack wilderness of northern New York State.
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Reflections

Does a new year represent merely the hanging of a new calendar on the wall, or is there some deeper significance? All lives—human and nonhuman—are regulated by the passage of days, and the year (as well as the month) is divided into twelve. Although the calendar year may be an arbitrary arrangement of days, it does serve us well to begin the new year as a time to glance back over the past year, evaluating both the good and the bad.

Although 1986 was not a banner year for animal rights in the sense of major campaign successes, it did usher in a new stage for the movement. The attainment of serious consideration by the general public. It can now be clearly demonstrated that a great deal of popular support exists for animal rights ideas, and there is no longer room in the movement for an "elitist" attitude. The "hard-core" veteran activist must make room for the newcomer who brings in new ideas, talents, and enthusiasm. All of us should welcome an infusion of energy and vitality, and not feel threatened by the growth process. While continuing to reflect a "radical" philosophy, THE ANIMALS' AGENDA will try to reach out to a wider audience, attracting, while it needs, "new blood" into the movement.

This new Congress convenes this month, and a Democratic majority in the Senate means all new committee heads. This change may brighten prospects for passage of animal protective legislation, and pro-animal bills are being readied by sympathetic legislators who will soon drop them into the Congressional hopper.

In our March issue (remember, we don't publish in February), we'll be reporting on those new bills.

Advice and Dissent

A good bit of time was spent in November poring over the tonnage of reader surveys you returned to us in the fall. In this month's COMMENT, we discuss your concerns about the movement—the issues and intramovement dynamics. Regarding our evaluation of THE ANIMALS' AGENDA, we're happy to know that most of you feel it's "striking a good balance."

We've been asked for more "how-to" kinds of articles, and more spotlighting of lesser-known organizations and activities. Many of you want information on how movement resources are being used, so as to better "invest" your contributions in response to the many different financial appeals you receive in the mail. You'd like more information on cruelty-free living, and request that we anticipate events far enough in advance so that we can plan a campaign.

You're interested in knowing more about the "other side"—their point of view as well as information on the strategies being employed by animal exploiters. We're glad to know that you'd like a better mixture of articles—covering a wide range of topics—and in the future we'll try not to emphasize any one area.

Readers called us on the carpet for allowing too much criticism to appear in the pages of this movement magazine. It seems that criticism—even when it is intended to be constructive—is what we agree with or it's directed at someone else. We will try, however, to treat with greater care in this regard.

Another sensitive area was brought to our attention with first-pounding resonance: religion. Many readers criticized us for "trashing" it, and others took issue with us for mentioning it. While we acknowledge that an appointment religious institutions have done precious little to advance the human ethic (and some have done their best to denounce it), there exists in the religious community a community that opposes animal and animal rights. While THE ANIMALS' AGENDA is not about to begin promoting any particular creed, we will continue to explore this important area, and try to encourage the development of animal rights as a serious religious concern.

We hope providing you with our insights, advice, and comments. A special thanks is owed also to those of you who sent contributions along with your completed surveys.

—The Editors

Korean Backwardness Breeds Cruelty

I write this letter because I believe you can help. I am a KOREAN violinist and have been the victim of cruel treatment of dogs and cats in Korea and other Asian countries. I am a Korean woman and mother, and also work as a veterinarian.

Many decades ago this country was very poor and there was not enough to eat. It was accordingly understandable that people would turn to dogs and cats for food. But now this country is becoming wealthy enough to obtain all the necessary protein from other sources. Nevertheless, in this country there are now butchers hired to search for other people's dogs and cats, to capture them, and kill them for meat.

In general, many people here, including children, are ignorant about the proper care of animals. There is a tendency, even among some pet owners, to be cruel. For example, a neighbor's cat was recently mauled and crying all night—in order to silence it, he put it in the freezer until it died of cold. Others throw their cats around and swing them at the other people; we're more toxic, if they should accidentally break their legs, they just throw them into the garbage.

Sometimes people intentionally starve cats to sell them for killing rats: many of them cannot catch rats, and are starved to death from people, wherein they are beaten to death. Sick pets are either caged and do not get enough food, or thrown to the streets. This cruelty not only applies to cats and dogs, but to all animals who are maltreated in this country.

Because of protests from other countries, the Korean government has passed a law against the consumption of dog and cat meat. Therefore, this practice is no longer common. However, this law is still widely occurs in the countryside and in the outskirts of the cities. The enforcement of this law is inadequate, and I am hoping that some sort of campaign can be initiated to influence other countries to protest this practice in the face of the 1988 Olympics to be held in Korea. It would be an opportunity to educate the Korean people about animal rights issues and the cruelty to animals. Such a campaign could bring about an improvement in animal treatment, not only in Korea, but in other Asian countries where the same kind of problems exist.

—A Citizen of South Korea

SUSTAINERS 1987

Human Society of the United States
National Anti-Vivisection Society
New England Anti-Vivisection Society
American Anti-Vivisection Society
Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Fund for Animals
Animal Protection Institute of America
International Society for Personal Rights
Peninsula Humane Society
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
Animal Rights Coalition for Alaska
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Arizona
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Hawaii
The Humane Society of New York

Hope Kinnee
Robert Bales
Natalie Helm
Mark Cohen
Patrick Shihe
Ellen Curtis Griffling
Walter Danielson
Stuart Brooks
Ann Forrest
Joan Flaherty
Bobbi Kadish
Short Back
Linda Bruyandeau
Catherine and Bob Lashi
Fran Clark
Dorothy Chunya
Ellen Spring
Doris Millaud
Diane Benedict
Bob Barnes
Francie Cohen
Jerry Levine
Mark Hermann, Cal Michael
Sam Perry
Estelle Elizabeth Barstow
Michael Frankfurter
George Carrino
Leon Spiegel
Howard Mann
Alan Sallarino
Mark Lamson
Alexander Associates, Eric Mitchell

"Hidden Crimes" a Bit Strident?

I read the September review of the videotape "Hidden Crimes" both before and after viewing it, and found your comments to be clear, concise and accurate.

Still, I feel I must take issue with your downplaying of its "occasional lapses into absolutism or overblown rhetoric."

Video imagery—from motion pictures to TV news—is fast becoming the most significant way of spreading the animal rights message. Costly productions like "Hidden Crimes" are important in raising awareness and providing an alternative window into the often opaque inner workings of the business. In the best tradition of investigative journalism, "Hidden Crimes" exposes the cruel and inhumane conditions of animals used in research. The video's "overblown rhetoric" of "Hidden Crimes" is a bit strident, but it is an opportunity to attract notice for the animal rights movement.

I was impressed by the clear and compelling presentation of the evidence. The video not only provides information on the conditions in research laboratories, but it also shows the emotional impact of such conditions on the workers who are forced to deal with these animals.

In conclusion, I urge you to support the animal rights movement by watching and discussing "Hidden Crimes." Your support is crucial in helping to bring about the end of animal experimentation and the protection of animal rights. Thank you for your consideration.
An Interview with Don Barnes  
Taking the pulse of the animal rights movement

Don Barnes' frequent travels across the country afford useful insights into the state of the struggle for animal rights.

INTERVIEWED BY DOUG MOSS

What's the general mood and attitude out there among grassroots leaders regarding the pace of progress in animal rights? In a sense, the very nature of the animal rights movement demands that participants be strongly individualistic; after all, their views are often in opposition to 99 per cent of their neighbors and it takes strength of character to continually battle against popular public opinion. What about the opposition in small communities where one cannot fade into the crowd? Small victories become vital as buffers against the broad reality of animal exploitation. Frustration definitely builds up the list of emotions and, as you would expect, there's a good deal of anger directed toward both our hedonistic society and, secondarily perhaps, toward those within the movement who appear motivated by personal gain rather than progress for animals.

What animal issues concern them most? By my definition, grassroots groups are small, almost always poor, and spend the majority of their time and energies on local issues. Pound seizure, spay-and-neuter facilities, local hunting and trapping bans, and the bias of public education are popular issues around which a small number of activists can attempt to rally their communities. Even so, national projects are of vital importance to local activists, for it has been through written information, videotapes of animal abuse, and meetings and rallies organized around national spokespersons that credibility with the local media has been garnered and maintained.

What issues are the buzz right now? As I see it, we're in a transition between hot issues at the moment. The University of Pennsylvania's Beagle/India labor controversy was the most recent major issue to involve practically all groups focused on their efforts. Winning that battle was a major victory for the entire movement.

There are several new threats "waiting in the wings" for national support, for example, reaching the religious community, the Gelnet boycott, and national pound seizure legislation. Any of these, or perhaps all, will provide local points for the movement in 1987 and, while it is difficult to predict, I do hope we manage to achieve the intra-movement unity required to make the most of these opportunities.

You rub elbows with the leaders of large organizations as well as with grassroots activists, particularly as a co-convener in the Pro-Pets Coalition. How do they feel about the "financial controversy"? What do they plan to do to respond to pressures to divert and to feed the movement more? As you might imagine, there isn't a lot of open discussion about the financial responsibilities of larger organizations to the smaller ones, and I'm not really sure there can be. It's difficult enough to define a grassroots group, and each must be weighed on its own merits. Requests for funds arrive almost hourly on the desks of the directors of the larger groups. Some have merit; many do not. A responsible manager has an obligation to his members and staff to defend our commitment for the organization and, unlike the National Institutes of Health, animal welfare rights organizations don't have a mechanism in place for evaluating such requests. It goes without saying that not every request can be honored. So the question becomes, "How can wealthier organizations work more closely with small groups to accomplish our mutual goals with highest efficiency?"

The ANIMALS' AGENDA has suggested a "Supersite" for those who have funds or people to put to work for distribution to active groups in the field. Many organizations do too much spending for publicity in organizations for the wrong purposes. Still, the problem of how to achieve the most efficient use of our resources for the animals remains, and it's a vitally important question for each of us to answer.

You and NARCS are involved in Pro-Pets, a coalition of several large organizations working on the issue of pound seizure, the use of homeless, unclaimed cats and dogs for research. Many animal advocates think that getting after the pound seizure issue is not a good strategy because it fosters the concept that dogs and cats are special animals, more worthy of humane consideration than rats, rabbits, monkeys, etc. And merely substituting purpose-bred dogs and cats for shelter animals doesn't seem to be the answer to the problem either. Care to comment?

While little causes me more grief than the common psychological depression of animal activists, I continue to believe that pound seizure is a meaningful arena for the animal rights movement. I still believe that increasing the cost of the animal will translate to fewer animals in the classrooms and in the laboratories. Also, pound seizure is an issue around which local communities can come together and, through such cooperation, become aware of the larger picture of animal exploitation.

What are some of the intra-movement problems that need to be addressed? As in every level of human activity, we are joined by those with self-serving motives. To dwell upon these individuals is to limit the energy we have available to affect positive change, and, while we criticize our opponents for their rigidity and failure to glimpse the hope of innovation, we are also guilty of zealous and ineffec- tive myopia in the pursuit of high-sounding principles. In a sense, our divisive attitudes mirror our strength as a movement comprised of independent thinkers and doers. It is this strength we must capitalize upon, for to spend time shedding tears over weaknesses is to suc- cumb to them. Of course, there are unethical people in this movement, at all levels, and if they can be shunted from the movement, fine, but if they are inex- tricably secured, do what you can to lock them; their hold while looking beyond them toward more positive actions. If you don't like the way things are being done, become a life member and demand change; don't stand outside and point fingers for the wrong reasons.

Do you call the animal rights movement a crusade?

The crusade concept is helpful in that it deals with the passion required to bring about change. I believe strongly in individualism, in the Victorians, as for- mer researcher taking the opposing view? Media response is generally excellent, but I consider it my duty to present alternative ideas along with concerns for human beings. I refuse to allow them to paint me with a misanthropic brush. Just because I am a former researcher in their polarization of the issues. This is to our advantage, as has been found that opponents' tenets are far nar- rower.
Roses are Red, Rose Hips Are Round,
The Seeds Are Yellow, And The Oil is Renowned!

High in the Andes mountains of South America grow the pink full-bloomed roses known among the people of Chile as Rosa Mosqueta. For years the hips from these roses were used to make jellies and jellies, but now medical research from a Santiago University shows that the oil from the Rosa Mosqueta seeds is effective in treating the skin for wrinkles and lines from premature aging.

Only the oil from the Rosa Mosqueta rose hips has this rejuvenating effect, according to the doctors, dermatologists, and chemists who have worked with it. The Chilean company that extracts the oil from the rose hip seeds (without chemical solvents) came to Aubrey because they knew he has a respect for natural herbal ingredients and that he would market the oil without adding synthetic chemicals that would inhibit its healing power. Plus, Aubrey has formulated a superb moisturizing cream using the oil from the Rosa Mosqueta, as well as herbal extracts of horsetail, coltsfoot, nettle, coneflower, St. John's wort, calendula, and sweet almond oil. Aubrey's Rosa Mosqueta Rose Hip Moisturizing Cream is an elegant, pale pink cream with a light rosy fragrance.

Apply the golden rose hip seed oil to dry and wrinkled areas, and massage it well into the skin. Then, for added rose hip benefits, apply a little Rosa Mosqueta Rose Hip Moisturizing Cream on top of the oil. Your skin will feel softer, smoother, and moisturized but not greasy.

Only Aubrey Organics has Rosa Mosqueta Rose Hip Seed Oil and Rosa Mosqueta Rose Hip Moisturizing Cream. Don't buy so-called rejuvenating creams with animal extracts based on animal experiments. Mother Nature (and her partner Aubrey Organics) has the answer to aging skin: Rosa Mosqueta Rose Hip Seed Oil.

4419 North Manhattan Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33614
Available At Better Health Food Stores Everywhere

Cosmetically Conscious Resolutions for 1987

Wouldn't it be wonderful if right now everybody stopped buying all products tested on animals? Toxicity testing accounts for around 70% of all animal testing, and ingredients that are tested on animals and used in cosmetics, detergent, and paper millions of laboratory animals every year. Think of it: the cosmetic industry consumes one million laboratory animals every year. Think of it: the cosmetic industry consumes one million laboratory animals every year. These animals are often treated cruelly and unnecessarily, subjected to pain and suffering.

1. READ COSMETIC LABELS. If a cosmetic ingredient looks like a synthetic chemical, it probably is. And if a cosmetic company uses synthetic ingredients, it is supporting animal testing because all synthetic cosmetic ingredients must be tested on animals. These companies have been tested, not by the cosmetic company itself, but by the raw materials manufacturer from whom it buys its ingredients. Remember: claims of safety, performance, etc. made by cosmetic companies for their products are usually based on animal tests. This practice exploits animals and is dangerous to humans because animal tests do not show what will happen to humans in regular use.

2. AVOID SYNTHETIC COLORS. Let's ignore the toxicity of the coal tar dyes for a minute and concentrate on the million of animals that have died in the testing of FD & C and D & C dyes. These colors have been used since the early 1900's and they have been tested over and over again, both to prove their safety and to prove their toxicity. These colors don't do anything useful or necessary. Avoid them for the animals' sake, as well as your own health.

3. AVOID SYNTHETIC PRESERVATIVES. Ditto number two: animals die to make these chemicals safe to sell, or usually to sell the idea that cosmetics don't perform any function but that of protection and convenience to the manufacturer.

4. AVOID SYNTHETIC DETERGENTS. Synthetic detergents (including the "cocaine derivatives" popular in many health food store brand cosmetics) are not desirable for several reasons: first, because they are tested on rabbits with the infamous Draize test; second, because their residue pollutes our water supplies; third, because they are drying to your skin and hair. Because soap is exempt from labeling laws, you have to know your manufacturer to be sure you're getting a soap without silica, an animal by-product used to harden most soap bars which is drying to the skin and may cause a soap film.

5. AVOID "CELL EXTRACT" CLAIMS FOR JUVENILE & ANTI-AGING. Despite the flood of catalogs, cell culture "rejuvenation" creams, there are plenty of all-harmful ingredients to choose from that work better than any cell-extract-containing cosmetic. Herbs have been used in body care for thousands of years for softening, smoothing, healing, moisturizing, and nourishing the skin and hair. Look for cosmetics that use lots of different herbs in appreciable quantities, and avoid cell-extraction claims based on animal extracts. For example, Rose Hip Seed Oil does help wrinkles and lines, but animal cell extracts don't.

6. DON'T SETTLE FOR HALF-NATURAL COSMETICS. Many cosmetic manufacturers say that their ingredients work better with synthetic chemicals and that all-natural cosmetics are impractical. That's like saying you shouldn't eat the tree if you can't eat the orange that's been artificially colored. Natural herbal ingredients are better for your hair and skin, they're better for the environment because they don't add to the chemicalization problem, and they're better for animals because natural ingredients are not generally tested on animals. Stay with cosmetic manufacturers who seek out and research natural ingredients that will work, rather than use the same old chemical cosmetic mix that most manufacturers use.

7. TELL YOUR health FOOD STORE OWNER YOU WANT ETHICAL COSMETIC PRODUCTS. Health food store owners don't always know if products they carry have been tested on animals or not. Let them know that you only buy NATURAL, non-animal-tested cosmetics.

8. LOOK FOR COSMETIC COMPANIES WHO REALLY SUPPORT ANIMAL RIGHTS. Most small cosmetic companies are so Paladin that they "don't use animals," but they still use claims of product effectiveness and safety based on animal tests. Don't fall for anti-animal testing "dogma" put your consumer dollars where the pro-animal companies are. Ask your health food store which companies speak out against animal testing; write or call and publish articles against animal testing in your own newspaper or magazine. Aubrey Hughes, Aubrey Organics' founder and president, has spoken on many occasions against this unscientific and immoral practice. We even run ads in animal rights publications like The Animals' Agenda.

LET'S MAKE 1987 A BETTER YEAR FOR ANIMALS!
The Battle to Stamp Out An Abominable Industry

Caged Blue Arctic Fox in a "fur farm" awaits his fate.

Despite a powerful climb in sales volume, the fur industry today faces difficult production and image problems that spell serious trouble ahead.

The number of wild animals trapped for furs in North America during 1986 was roughly 45 million, of which about 20.3 million were the fur-bearing species that trappers wanted. The rest were birds, small rodents, stray pets, and other "trash" animals that were tossed aside. (Although usually forgotten by these animals, too, contributed their suffering to the making of fur garments.) About 26 percent of those totals were trapped in Canada, the rest in the United States. Approximately 25 million more animals were gassed, electrocuted, clubbed, or otherwise slaughtered at fur farms—4.5 million in Canada, 30.5 million in the U.S.

These are the statistics that concern ecologists and animal defenders, but pro- and anti-fur campaigners are just now tallying up their most important 1986 figures: final sales of fur, profit vs. loss, and public contributions to anti-fur organizations.

Marching through Toronto's fur sales district on November 29, anti-fur protesters brought the conflict into the open once again, hoping to catch the media's attention. Similar marches followed in many American cities. The fur industry, in an attempt to steady the nerves of its retailers, promptly set up a toll-free hotline which stores facing protests could call for quick tactical advice.

The month before Christmas is, of course, the traditional peak sales month for the fur industry and the peak fund-raising time for many animal rights groups. But with fur ads sprouting up all over, it's also the time of year when the struggle between pro- and anti-fur groups begins to heat up and make the news.

In 1986, most of the major international animal rights groups united for the first time in open warfare against the fur trade. The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) drew the battle lines at its Lisbon, Portugal, convention. Taking a stand previously reserved to small, "radical" groups, WSPA called for both an international campaign against the wearing of any kind of fur, and a European Economic Community ban on the import or sale of any trapped fur.

The Pressure Mounts

In Canada, the powerful Association for Protection of Fur-bearing Animals (APFA) is undergoing a similar radicalization. "We have a special problem," director George Clements admits, "because we were founded specifically to oppose cruel trapping methods." But Clements acknowledges increasing sympathy for the anti-fur push. "We seemed to be getting nowhere," he says of 15 years' effort to ban leghold trapping. APFA has accordingly stepped up its distribution of anti-trapping information to other groups. Latest APFA production is a six-minute film on trapping called "Time to Care," narrated by WSPA's star Loreta Swift.

Noting that John Hoyt, head of the Humane Society of the United States, now presides over WSPA as well, Clements hopes that HSUS will become an even stronger voice against fur products. "It's been embarrassing," he continues, "al-"
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protests. The actions were part of T.S.U. efforts to correct what students call a "Far-Free America." The con-
cept, created by members of a similar campaign for "no smoking" and "nuclear-free zones," says Cove. This na-
tional campaign is based on the recognition that the traditional tactics utilized by the animal-protection movement have completely failed to stem the rising tide of fur production and slaughter of fur-bearing animals. We believe that as a movement we have failed to attract new customers, to create a new public, to name the image of glamour, prestige, and status surrounding fur."

The current trend, then, may be, at long last, over. At least in the United States, in-
dications are that the fur market is not well growing. The European market for mink has virtually died out, according to the Canadian Department of External Affairs, but increased exports to the U.S. have helped keep the mink industry alive. In addition, Asia has developed fur ranching as a major industry in the past decade, almost en-
tirely in the service of the U.S. market, and now it has developed itself into a potential market for sealskins and other Canadian furs.

Since 1972, U.S. retail sales of furs have climbed from $561.6 million to an esti-
mated $2 billion in 1986. Retail growth has occurred every single year, according to statistics compiled by the American Fur Industry, Inc. of New York. Allow-
ing for inflation, the retail part of the business has undeniably tripled and perhaps even quadrupled over the past 15 years.

There are signs, however, that the produc-
tion side of the fur industry isn't doing as well as sales. Spots of trading licenses have declined 50 per cent in most states since 1968, and the number of U.S. pro-
fessional trappers is down from an estimated 40,000 to perhaps 22,000. The
drop coincides with a 50 per cent drop in the prices paid to trappers for their pelt.

And, today, the prices trappers still in the business depend less on trapping for their livelihood.

This drop accompanies a major shift in fur sources. As recently as 1979, according to the new U.S. Census, ‘55 per cent of the nation's fur came from one raised at a ranch. By 1984, A.F.I. Inc. was predicting that "a" 90 per cent of fur were ranching. Toward the end of 1986, indus-
try spokesperson estimated that anywhere from 65 to 85 per cent of fur were ranching. About 1,100 U.S. mink farms ship up to four million animals per year, yet while 100 per cent of Persian lamb comes from captivity, along with the majority of fox and rabbit.

However, A.F.I. spokesperson Lisa states that the ranched furs are es-
appreciated for publicity purposes. "The fur industry doesn't want to admit how many animals they're taking out of the wild," she says. But even trying for blotted figures, the rate of ranched fur is up because with feed prices sharply down, ranching animals is cheaper than trapping them, and the animal supply can be controlled more precisely. Furthermore, ranches, with heavy investments in equipment and animals, are less likely to get out of business when pelts prices are kept. Fact is, the U.S. fur in-
dustry is making higher profits every year--chiefly because fur prices are so low. But retailers are able to buy cheap, sell cheap to attract new customers, and turn a windfall because since 1980 raw furs have flooded the market.

As an anti-fur sentiment rose abroad during the early 1980s, U.S. fur exports declined almost 60 percent from the 1980 high of $833.1 million. The decline was as marked and steady as the domestic retail growth. Meanwhile, U.S. fur importers doubled in value over the same period, even doubling to $1.8 billion.

Both ranchers and U.S. fur ranchers are pressed increasing hard by competition from Asia--principally South Korea and Hong Kong. The Asian producers pay less for labor, have little or no animal welfare standards to observe (not that U.S. standards are strong), and benefit equally by low world feed grain prices. Like U.S. automobile and steel producers, U.S. trappers and fur ranchers now have only one significant market--at home--and they are fast losing that, too.

The Canadian Fur Trade Stalls Out

While the U.S. fur industry centers around retail sales, with garment finish-
ing in second place, Canada is chiefly the raw fur export business--in direct competition with both U.S. producers and Asia. Consequently, the Canadian fur industry is now in steep decline. Canadian fur interests hope their final 86 figures will include a bigger share of the U.S. record retail profits. Canadian fur dealers have recently been selling to the U.S. at their lowest prices in a decade, both to compete with Southeast Asia and to dump fur stockpiles they couldn't sell to Europe.

Between 1981 and 1984, Canada lost 85 per cent of its European fur market. Dur-
ing that time, Canadian fur exports to Europe declined from $159 million per

year to $77 million. In 1984, press reports estimated that the Canadian fur business lost $500 million annually, with more than half the furs exported. The Canadian government, worth approximately 90 Canadian dollars, is worth approximately $90 million per year. In 1985, however, the Canadian government, worth approximately 90 Canadian dollars, is worth approximately $90 million per year.

The Fur Industry Strikes Back

The Canadian fur industry defense force presently includes: the Fur Coun-
cil of Canada, a multi-fur group uniting some 28 fur trade organizations; the Fur Institute of Canada, founded in 1983 to counter and oppose the movement; the public relations firm Gray & Company, hired by the F.I.C. and numerous other strategies, publicists, spokesmen, and lobbyists provided by the Canadian government. The F.I.C. also directly subsidizes both the F.I.C. and other such government groups as the Aboriginal Trappers Federation of Canada (AFTFC), organized in 1984, and In-
dependent Fur Producers, a new organization, organi-
ized in 1985. The latter is essentially the "fur traders' union" in the United States, and both groups are units of the National Fur Trade Association (NFTA).

The new campaign has also taken on other fur-fighting groups, such as the Animal Rights Coalition (ARC), which has been heavily involved in Canada for the past two years. The ARC's main thrust has been to coordinate animal rights and environmental groups, which it believes can work together to effect a "sea change" in the way people think about animal issues.

Recent initiatives include the following: the ARC's "Stop the Hunt" campaign, which aims to stop the hunting of sea lions; the "Fur-Free Futures" campaign, which seeks to improve the conditions under which fur is produced; and the "Fur-free Friday" campaign, which encourages people to wear fur-free clothing on that day.

The ARC has also been involved in a number of court cases, including one in which it successfully challenged the constitutionality of a law that made it illegal to sell or wear fur in Canada.

The Canadian government has also been active in the fur trade, with a number of initiatives aimed at promoting the industry. These include the Fur Industry Development Program (FIDP), which provides financial assistance to fur farmers, and the Fur Industry Economic Development Act (FIEDA), which provides tax incentives to fur farmers.
Cont'd from previous page

dustry is one of the few industries in America today that protects and preserves the wilderness and all the creatures that live in it," proclaimed Fred Schwartz with typical cheek, to a somewhat incredulous Wall Street Journal reporter. It is estimated that out of 2500 fur retailers in the U.S., the group has solicited 1600 and has monetary contributions from 150 and 200—not exactly an awesome show of support, despite the promotional hoopla.

The American fur industry's strongest defense so far has been the marketing of furs to working women, in addition to the introduction of many other frivolous fur products (furry toys, mementos, etc.). And while Canadian apologists for the fur industry continue to shed phony tears over the so-called economic and cultural genocide of Native American fur trappers, the industry (with active government encouragement), is quietly using proportionately more tanned fur. Apparently a high level government consensus has concluded that no form of trapping will ever seem humane to most people, and that animals drowning or starving and freezing with broken limbs represent an upper public relations task.

Indeed, the leghold trap has served as a catalyst to raise public concern about the fur issue, even though the demands for its abolition or "humane redesign" may have proved perfectly futile. Sum up Anne Sterrer, Montreal representative for the International Wildlife Coalition, "It's an anti-fur movement now. Ten years ago we diddled around with protests against the leghold trap, but I think there are some 4,000 patents on different kinds of traps, and none of them are humane. We've found the movement has radicalized and hardened into what it should have been all along—a movement to make wearing of fur socially unacceptable."

Doreen Pooley of Toronto-based Ark II

Although some animal activists consider fake furs as objectionable as real furs, some groups back the alternative as a compromise in an imperfect world.

echoes Sterrer. "We have people who approach us and say, 'Yes, I wear fur, but my fur isrehed, so it's all right.' We tell them it isn't all right, that the suffering and cruelty and exploitation that goes on at those ranches is just as vile and horrible as what goes on in trapping. If they don't see it, it's because they don't want to see it. You know, in certain parts of Scan-
dinavia, people who wear furs are spat upon in the street, and they've been wearing furs since the Ice Age. We don't want people to be spat upon, because we want to reach the same point in our consciousness of the suffering of animals.

Thus, Canadian animal welfare groups seem to have adopted the philosophy expressed in Trans-Species Unlimited's coordinator manual for the "Campaign for a Fur-Free America": "There is little to choose between the suffering of trapped and ranch-raised animals. The wearing of an animal's skin is morally unconscionable and inexcusable, whatever its source, and irrespective of whether the animal happens to belong to an endangered or threatened species. Our ultimate aim is the complete abolition of the fur industry and the outlawing of the trapping and ranch-raised fur production."

Social and Political Reversions

At local taverns, Montreal fur workers describe a trade in flux. "It's more of a seasonal job now," says one cutter, who declared to be identified to reach the public. "Last year round. You'd meet the winter de-
dand, and then stockpile for next Christmas. Now, they lay you off one week, call you back and have you work overtime the next.

The floor-level impression is that furrier workers are getting out, looking for steadier jobs and more certain

Since 1972, U.S. retail sales of furs have climbed from $361.6 million to an estimated $2 billion in 1986. futures. The older, skilled workers are counting the days to retirement. Raises are few, and morale is low. Pride in the work is waning; many fur workers hesi-
tate to introduce themselves as such, saying it's because that they "take home the littlest patterns."

An almost identical pattern of figure—Continued on page 37

The complain that the "Fun-Bearers' excellent videotape "Time to Care" (VHS in.), which depicts the horrors of trapping, is now available for $25.00. (There's also a 16mm copy available. For more info, contact the Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals at 2625-0411, or write them at 2320 Commercial Drive, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V5N 4G6.

•Probablelv no newspaper in the nation runs as many fur ads as The New York Times, but now this paper is compound-
ing its traditional moral myopia with regard to conspicuous consumption (entire sections devoted to nothing but quick, home decorating, and wine) with personal advice on how best to finance fur coat acquisitions. In an Oct. 26 piece signed by Deborah Rankin, the newspaper goes to great lengths to in-
troduce prospective buyers to some of the financial tricks available to them. "If the price tag of your dream coat is bet-
tier than your bank balance, many stores will gladly extend credit," coos Rankin. She then proceeds to detail the credit and interest arrangements of most major fur retailers, the credit unisons, and banks. "Banks will lend funds for a fur, though some ad-

'This is an A-Fur-Free Zone

The animal rights movement has produced a vast array of anti-fur publicity materials, including excellent resource books, bumper stickers, introductory brochures and lapel buttons.

"TV shows abound in bad examples, but few can hold a candle to the likes of Dynasty or that phenomenon, Wheel of Fortune. Both shows continue deplorably fur in front of the mindless masses as great symbols of the good life we all ought to aspire to. Although we can't guarantee that those letters will accomplish much, try writing them anyway. Dynasty can be reached through producers Apec; Wheel of Fortune is accessible through its host Pat Sajak at Box 436, Hollywood, CA 90025. Project Hootowl has put together one of the most effective resource kits we've come across. The 'Anti-Fur Resource Book' lists scores of examples of anti-fur ads, bumper stickers, buttons, brochures, etc., designed and produced by various groups. Most of the ads are camera-ready. Contact them Box 576, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

"According to Doris Primack of Animals in Politics, our best chance is the public lies with films or videos. "A color film's impression is immediate, visceral, and needs no intellec-
tualizing," says Primack. "It is the one tool furriers fear, since no amount of debating can refute the testimony." Primack thinks that exposure to black and white photos accompanied by words is behind the success of "The Hunt" mainly from the "semi-convinced." Color photos improve the impact, but the reaction is still much too weak. Similarly, es-
pousing consumer送料, exposure is key, exposing one that the fur industry has engaged some extremely persuasive speakers.

"—P. Grannville
Today wild horses are being used as "acacregats" for damage caused by livestock overgrazing, and they’re losing out. At the best of agricultural interests, in 1985, 9,979 wild equids were rounded up by helicopters, funnelled into traps, and hauled off to holding pens to await their cloudy fate. In 1986, 12,300 were rounded up, about half in Nevada. The 1986 appropriation of $48.2 million for roundups was "tagged onto" a funding bill for Fiscal Year 1986 over the objections of a substantial number of Senators, and would not have stood a chance of passing on its own. In a madd spirit of domination over the natural world, many Westerners, bound by their own tradition of unrestrained exploitation, mock the very concept of wilderness and freedom they claim to identify with. To them, "freedom" means the freedom to do as they "damn well please" when it comes to their fellow creatures.

Most residents of the tactics employed by the livestock (and hunting) establishments to eliminate the wild horse is a nefarious smear campaign—a deluge of negative propaganda that would have the public believe that somehow humans created the horse, and that a horse living in the wild is an aberration that can only wreak destruction. If one were to believe this lie, the beautiful horses, running wild all alone, would appear to be the very "kiss of death" to all it teaches. Yet, millions of equids roam North America just a century ago, and thrived in harmony with the buffalo, the elk, the puma, and all the other native denizens of the land.

Considering this history, one must suspect the underlying motivation of wild horse detractors. A vested interest rarely admits to the value of a conflicting interest, one that would check or curb its monopoly over the resource base.

Sheep and cattle ranchers are issued permits to graze livestock on public lands, mostly in western states. According to 1984 Public Land Statistics, there are 12,300 licensed operators on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) operated lands who graze 3,973,221 head of livestock on 156,884,419 acres. The U.S. Treasury currently loses $33 million per year on public lands devoted to livestock grazing. Receipts for grazing privileges totaled just under $43 million—paltry sum to compensate for the long-term devastation wrought by the livestock industry.

The public lands grazing fee currently pays only $1.35 per "animal unit month" (to feed a 1,000-pound cow, or five sheep, on the public range for a month). This fee is several times below the "fair market value" conservatively estimated at $6.65. And, although Congress passed a bill to rectify this situation, President Reagan vetoed it in 1986 and kept the grazing fee at $1.35—a clear hypocrisy in the face of his drastic cuts in other domestic programs, and an obvious blip in favor of the "cowboy" lobby he so admires. According to Paul Janice, a BLM wild horse specialist, "By the time you consider range improvements made by the BLM, the rancher is paying less than 50 cents a month (the cost of a soda) to keep a cow on public land."

Under the Reagan administration, the BLM has chosen to call "faulty" several years of rangeline "trend" evaluation from previous administrations. The evaluations have been ignored, because they pointed to livestock reduction. In direct contradiction to earlier efforts, a large increase in authorized livestock use of grazing district lands occurred between the years of 1980 and 1984—an increase that continues right up to the new year. In 1986, 1,964,826 animal "units" were permitted, by 1984, the figure had risen to 2,323,183—an increase in excess of 18 percent.

In May of 1986, the House Government Operations Committee found that the public is paying millions of dollars a year to subsidize western ranchers to graze livestock on federal land in 16 states. The public lands ranchers number about 31,000 nationwide, and constitute a tiny and pampered element of society. They enjoy an unfair advantage even among America's 1.6 million livestock producers. Forty per cent of public lands grazing privileges is controlled by three percent of those holding permits—and they are frequently corporate giants, such as oil tycoons, or lobbyist rancher millionaires, including doctors and lawyers. Rather than curbing the monopoly of public lands, the Reagan administration is increasing this abusive industry's stranglehold.
Battle With BLM Lawsuit Update

By CLEVELAND AMORY

The high point of the Fund for Animals/Animal Protection Initiative campaign to prevent the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on behalf of wild horses, came after a long, hard and difficult struggle between their lawyers and ours. At a hearing on June 13, 1986, Magistrate Phyllis Atkins told BLM attorneys that after a careful reading of the Wild and Free-Range Horses and Burros Act, she found nothing in it which permitted the kind of cruelly destructive activity which had repeatedly engaged in. At this same hearing, the BLM for the first time admitted that in some cases they had used horses for “commerical purposes,” i.e., rodeo or slaughter—but they had, just the same, favored these “adopters” with the fee waivers and power of attorney documents.

This admission was a real breakthrough, exposing the duplicity of the Bureau. A year ago, for example, before the adopter was fixed, in a BLM bulletin entitled “Your Public Lands, Special Wild Horse and Burro Issue,” the BLM flatly denied that horses were being slaughtered. And if there’s one thing worse than a serial killer of the world, it’s a serial killer of the future. Since this is the kind of deceit we have been up against all along—a torrent of disinformation unleashed by public relations experts led by Senator James McClure (R-Mt), at the expense of the hapless animals.

Senator McClure has been chiefly responsible for the allowance of what will soon amount to 50 million tax dollars a year to the “pampered cattlemen.” They are the very people responsible for so many of the wild horses being on the range today. Having turned out the domesticated horses when they got tired of feeding them, and now, in a kind of guilt by association, the BLM—by a series of measures—has done the same to horses by the BLM—in many cases free—to make more money out of them by sale to slaughter.

If our suit had done nothing more than show up this whole wild horse scandal for what it is—a scheme for the rich to get richer—it would have been worth it; but it has done far more than that. Last February, when our agent visited a horrible feedlot in Nevada, he found 5000 wild horses in various degrees of distress that were to be “urban single veterans.” Yet the person run- ning this mess was receiving $50,000 a year. When our agent asked to see the so-called “graffiti” corral, he was told, “Oh, you wouldn’t want to see it—they get leg broken and eyes filled with mud.” When our agent said that was exactly what he did want to see, the operator revealed that he was under orders not to let anyone near that corral.

Nowadays, in contrast, while the lawsuit proceeds, we have received what amounts to court-ordered permission to monitor every phase of the roundup, and this is being done under the able direction of Fund volunteer Pamela Wilmore. What ANIMALS’ AGENCY readers who possess particular knowledge of the rounds can do is: 1) get in touch with Ms. Wilmore via the Fund for Animals' New York office (212-224-2096); 2) get in touch with Bob Hillman via the Animal Protection Institute office in Sacramento (916-422-1921); 3) stop eating meat!

In western America, 225 million acres (an area equivalent to the 13 original states) has become wasteland through livestock overgrazing and other abusive agricultural practices.

Wild horses and burros inhabiting our public lands constitute only a minute percentage compared with either or both domestic livestock and wild animals ranging around two million at the turn of the century, at this time, the equid population has been reduced to about 42,000. Dividing 42,000 equids by 2,283,183 animal units yields 18.61 equids per animal unit. From this it can be ascertained that the wild horse and burro grazing pressure on public lands is only 1.60 per cent of that generated by domestic livestock. Yet, our public servants, the Department of the Interior and the BLM continue to target wild horses for drastic reductions—a target set back in 1986. According to Senator Alan Cranston (D-Cal), “...the wild horse and burro population today is well below that set for the western states in 1986...” Since 1973, right after the passage of the Wild and Free-Range Horses and Burros Act in 1971, the Act was originally passed to rescue the fast dwindling herds from extinction and to prevent their abuse. Amendments subsequent to the Act, coupled with already government regulations, have considerably changed the Act as well as the 1971 "Wild Horse Act". Also designed to prevent cruelty to these animals. In 1976, the Federal Land Policy must be exercised by the federal government, i.e., the BLM and the United States Forest Service (USFS), to employ motorized vehicles, including helicopters, in the roundup of wild equids. Thus, many of the same abuses have occurred in 1976 as the BLM have resulted that were commonplace during airborne enclosure of earlier decades. According to Senator Alan Cranston (D-Cal), "...the 1979 Wild Horse and Burro Act which first made illegal any actions of land or roundups of wild equids on federal lands."

In 1978, the Public Lands Improvement Act was passed, which further compromised wild horse and burro protection by granting title to wild horse adopters. This was followed by another act, the 1981 Wild and Free-Range Horses and Burros Act, which first made illegal any actions of land or roundups of wild equids on federal lands. In 1982, the Public Lands Improvement Act was passed, which further compromised wild horse and burro protection by granting title to wild horse adopters after one year. Previously, a wild equid was afforded the full protection of the law and was treated as a free-roaming person and their livestock. Under the current law, adopters are able to sell their adopted horses without ever to sub- ject them to humiliating conditions after they gain title. Massive adoptions of 25 or more animals take place, and large profits are made through sale and slaughter. Deeply disturbing are the discretionary powers that can be exercised by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to determine "excess" numbers of wild equids. A National Academy of Science study was mandated to help the Secre- taries define "excess"; but the results are being selectively interpreted to justify maximum reduction. Many of the popu- lation levels being proposed for the various herds are below the 50 breeding animals recommended as the minimal viable breeding population. Fewer than 50 and problems with in- breeding and genetic drift may arise.

The argument is often presented that wild horses compete and interfere with the interests of wildlife (a complaint fre- quently voiced by big-game hunters). However, horses and burros represent only 1.9 per cent of the estimated 185,000 big-game animals on these lands, including approximately 231,300 antelope, 800 buffalo, 16,800 bighorn sheep, 250,000 caribou, 69,900 elk, 1,134,100 deer, and 87,000 moose. Com- pared to those population figures, the wild equids are insignificant in number, and it is not hard to conclude that there is a vendetta presently being perpetrated against them.

Both the USFS and the BLM, the two agencies charged with preservation of wild horses, have been loath to comply with the intent of Congress as originally expressed in 1971. Thousands of wild horses have "disappeared" from lands administered by the USFS since en- actment of the law to protect them. Domestic cattle and sheep, however, con- tinue to graze the summer pastures in the mountains where wild horses once roamed.

It appears highly doubtful that we can trust the BLM to leave even viable populations, or agreed upon numbers, in the various wild horse herds and according to the gloomy picture for the wild horse is current evidence pointing to stepped-up illegal roundup, fueled by the profit motive and the ongoing massive government support of wild horses and burros. Suspect transactions include an inordinate number of stallions, most of whom are sold directly to rodeo for bucking stock. Other grounds for suspicion are common transactions in- volving transfers to the USFS, in which several individuals—including the domi- nant group of stallions with names and affixing signs that describe the desert bands of Nevada. The names of known mustangs appear in the records frequently.

Moreover, the deplorable treatment to which captured wild horses are subjected deserves recognition. Between 19800 and 20,000 currently experienced "concentration...Continued on page 33. Keep on eye on Congress

According to Animals in Politics (T.D. Box 1286, New York, NY 10011), the act in the western drama is yet to come, and animal advocates have already begun to mobilize for it. At some point this year, the BLM will have 15,000 to 20,000 horses collected in the facilities whose maintenance will cost the taxpayers a hefty sum. This for "useless" animals who are merely vegetating (at best) in the corrals. The BLM has worked to create this situation, and will be able to go to Congress, state that most of the animals are unadoptable, and that the only way to dispose of them—and save the taxpayer money—is by amending the Wild and Free-Range Horses and Burros Act. Giving BLM "sale authority" (at which time "excess" horses would be sold directly to the public, with every dollar then going to the new Democratic Senate majority, the Congressional picture may not have changed much... Although Senator McClure (R-Mt), once the enemy of the BLM, is now the champion. According to the New York Times, McClure aide explained that the Treasury would be the chief group that would sell horses. The group would be an"honest person". For updates in future issues of The ANIMALS’ AGENCY, write your legislators now expressing concern for the future of America’s wild horses...—The Editors
COME HARP SEAL WATCHING WITH US!

Atlantic Marine Wildlife Tours is pleased to offer exclusive wildlife excursions to visit the Harp Seal nurseries on the pack ice off Prince Edward Island in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Tours extend throughout the month of March and through the last four nights of April. From our base of operations, Prince Edward Island with meals, quality accommodation, air and helicopter transport, and presentations on the seals by knowledgeable staff. Price is $1750 U.S. Low-cost day trips from Charlottetown are also available at $325. Join experienced guides on the pack ice of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to view Canada's most memorable wildlife encounter. For additional information call (506) 459-SEAL, or write Atlantic Marine Wildlife Tours Ltd., 127 Wright St., Fredericton, NB E3B 2E3, CANADA.

A cat and kittens rescued from Gordon-Lickey's lab.

**ANIMAL NEWSLINE**

The Animal Liberation Front Strikes Again

Lab break-in at the University of Oregon

On Sunday morning, October 26, the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) raided an animal breeding/holding facility at the University of Oregon, removing 204 animals and causing an estimated $50,000 in damage. According to newspaper accounts of the raid, animals taken were cats, rabbits, pigeons, rats, and hamsters. Destroyed equipment included a stereotaxic device, a microscope, an electrocardiogram machine, an X-ray machine, an incubator, and a sterilizer. Animal rights messages were spray-painted on the laboratory walls. The raid was targeted at two groups of experimenters: those of Dr. Barbara Gordon-Lickey and Richard T. Morrocco.

Gordon-Lickey's experiments focused on "visual deprivation" in cats and kittens. The experiments involved cutting kittens' eyes muscles and rotating the eyeballs into offset positions in order to distort visual perception. Alternatively, kittens' eyelids were sutured shut. In some cases, both methods were used on a single subject. Some groups of kittens were then tested for "jumpy behavior"—each kitten was forced to jump from a small tower onto a ten-inch square platform placed in a shallow pan of water.

Kittens were tested from progressively higher heights until they missed landing on the platform with all four feet four out of five times. Other kittens who had been partially blinded by eyelid rotation or eyelid suturing were chemically paralysed, anesthetized, and placed in stereotaxic devices. The scalp was cut open, a hole was cut into the skull, and a 19-gauge needle containing a tungsten microelectrode was lowered into various regions of the brain and visual cortex. A variety of moving visual stimuli were projected onto a screen in front of the kitten, and electrical activity of various areas of the brain in response to the visual stimulus was recorded. Each kitten was used in one to six such sessions, each lasting from six to 35 hours.

Among Dr. Gordon-Lickey's conclusions: At each age tested, performance with rotated eye was worse than with the unoperated eye. "If a kitten's eye is rotated 90 degrees shortly after birth, the kitten grows up with an abnormal relationship between the retina and the visual world." An animal reared with artificial squint (eye muscles cut) will fail to develop and follow more successfully with the unoperated eye than with the operated eye.

These experiments are representative of Dr. Gordon-Lickey's 17 years of research, and have been repeated numerous times with minor variations, costing taxpayers more than 1.2 million dollars in government grant money over the past two decades. There are no documented cases of human eyeight being saved or even improved as a result of Gordon-Lickey's research.

Dr. Morrocco's experiments are similar to Gordon-Lickey's in that they involve investigations into those regions of the brain controlling vision. However, Dr. Morrocco uses non-human primates (rhesus macaques) as his experimental subjects. Electrodes, metal bolts and plastic caps are surgically implanted into the brains of the animals, various forms of visual stimulation are presented, and brain activity is recorded. The animals in Morrocco's experiment additionally receive electric shocks through bipolar electrodes implanted into the front end of each monkey's head. At the conclusion of the experiment, monkeys are killed and their brains removed for analysis. Dr. Morrocco has recently requested over $230,000 from the National Science Foundation, along with over $170,000 from the Office of Naval Research, to fund a three-year project continuing this same type of research. He intends to conduct research on and keep 26 rhesus macaque monkeys in the proposed project.

—Lea Rice

**ANIMAL NEWSLINE**

TWELVE TIMES MORE CHLOROPHYLL

Independent laboratory analysis shows Pines Wheat Grass provides up to twelve times more chlorophyll, vitamins and minerals per dollar than other green food supplements. It also supplies more fiber. Tablets expand more than eight times their original size for a highly concentrated and economical source of the nutrients and fiber contained in deep green, leafy vegetables.

Pines wheat grass and young barley products are organically grown as nature intended—outdoors in the cold winter and spring of Eastern Kansas. . . for maximum nutrient levels and perfect flavor.

ALL-VEGETABLE 55% PROTEIN 17% FIBER

ABOUT ANIMALS, THE QUESTION IS...

22-minute AV program with extensive study guide Producer: PAWS. Funded, in part, by Washington Commission for the Humanities.

EXTEND YOUR REACH!

"About Animals" is designed for thought, not shock. Lay out movement issues for H.S./college classes/civic groups using proven teaching techniques.

"A good initial foray into the issues." — animal rights activist.

"This is a film I would enthusiastically recommend for all college age audiences." — teacher, philosophy, University of Washington.

"I felt the film was — here's the facts — let's see what you can do with them." — high school senior.

"This is a blueprint for a NOA program." — Executive Producer, PBS-TV station.

ALL FORMATS INCLUDE GUIDE AND POSTAGE

15-framed filmstrip/audiocassette: $37.00

¾ VIDEOCASSETTE (VHS): $37.00

1½-slides in Carousel tray, audiocassette: $65.00

Washington state residents include 7.8% sales tax.

ORDER FROM: PAINS, P.O. Box 1037, Lynnwood WA 98046.
**Driftnets Threaten Marine Life**

A plague is afflicting the animals of the North Pacific. The casualty list is staggering. A Japanese fishing vessel released drift nets to entangle birds. Environmentalists haul up driftnets to free entangled birds.

The driftnet fishery numbers about 1,700 vessels. The combined sets of these boats total more than one million miles each year. As much as 1,000 miles of netting are lost or discarded annually and become "ghost" nets, carried by the ocean currents, which capture even more marine animals. There are no accurate estimates of the carnage from ghost nets.

Documentation on the fisheries is limited except for that portion of the Japanese salmon fishery fishing in U.S. waters. Even on those boats whose coverage is less than seven per cent, and the Japanese captains can assign observers to whichever boats they choose. This fraction of the fleet is estimated to be responsible for the mortality of 180,200 seabirds and up to 5,000 Dall's porpoises each year. If official estimates from the land-based salmon fishery are included, these figures would double. Studies indicate that 80 per cent of the porpoises caught by the observed fishery are either pregnant or lactating females, indicating that these individuals are taking place in breeding grounds.

Data on the squid fleets is almost nonexistent. One U.S. observer documented 30 sets in 1986 (out of over 30,000). In 30 drift net sets, the nets captured 3,800 porpoises, 43 Northern right whale dolphins, one striped dolphin, and 34 Northern fur seals. Obviously, the sample is so limited that extrapolations for the entire fishery cannot be made, but there is cause for concern.

Increasing public awareness of this environmental disaster was responsible for some action in three recent despatches in the Senate committees held hearings on the issue. Surprisingly, one of the leaders has been Senator Bob Dole (R-Kansas), who has often been at odds with environmentalists. He introduced the Driftnet Monitoring, Assessment and Control Act as a first step towards addressing the problem. Congressperson Charles Bennett (D-Florida) introduced a companion bill, which was modified and was finally reported out of committee, but was not brought to the floor because of a legislative logjam at the end of the session.

Among the provisions of the proposed legislation were requirements that obser- vers be on boats which use this method of fishing, and that the Secretary of Commerce submit recommendations to Congress for dealing with the problem. The fishing industry would lose development of a net marking system so that those responsible for the ghost nets could be identified, and it would have set up a bounty system for those who recover lost nets. Perhaps most important, it would have created a 60-mile drift net-free zone, which is a major seabird breeding area.

Both Senator Stevens and Congressperson Bennett will be reintroducing the bills carrying these new amendments. Concerned about the problem should contact their local or State Senators, indicating support for the legislation, and requesting co-sponsorship of the bills.

Driftnets are rapidly becoming a plague which will affect all of the world’s oceans. Unless they are phased out, entire sec- tors of marine life will be eliminated. The blank netting will move across vast, wet "deserts" devoid of fish, marine mammals, and seabirds.

- Dave Wilkinson, Greenpeace U.S.A.

**Forest Napalming in Texas Sparks Protest**

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is establishing a subsidiary "crushing and dying" operation in Texas to cut down acres of American forests, animal inhab- antants being left to their fate. The USFS says it has used helicopters loaded with torches to destroy firebreaks and forests, and gasoline on selected acreage since 1979.

Although it has been implemented all over the country, the policy has only recently been lighted as a result of plans to cut 500 acres of the Four Notch area of the Sam Houston Na- tional Forest in Texas. At the time of this writing, 60 per cent of the crushed phase has been completed. The proposed heliblighting involves spraying the burning residue of loggers into the area and moving the fire inward in concentric circles. For the wildlife trapped inside, this means being forced further and further into the center and eventually be- ing burned alive. "It’s like Vietnam,” a forest official adds, "all over again with them dropping napalm in the forests and in some places directly on the backs of animals," said Sierra Club Wilderness Chairperson George Russell. However, it is most surprising to hear the proposal to the slow starvation that will result from large-scale habitat destruction.

The reason for the destruction most frequently cited in press reports is a need to remedy a pine beetle infestation. Yet forestry experts familiar with Four Notch says that although there was an "infestation" of the insect two years ago, it completed its natural cycle and is no longer a significant factor in that ecosystem. Texas USFS Supervisor Mike Lewis concludes that the beetle is no longer a prob- lem. The USFS is said to be trying to enable the Service to reintroduce the pine. However, visits by activists to the area have been met with minimal hostility, and there is no evidence of the managed trees in the present. Asked why the Forest Service would wage war on American forests, Forest Service employee Richard D. Blaine said, "The Forest Service has worked closely with the industry for many years, and the good-old-boy system is deeply entrenched in the relationship." The spraying operations are conducted out of private industry Fund for Animals Vice President Louis Regeinstein said, "The Forest Service uses controlled burning as a standard management tool all over the country; it’s the first one to have attracted attention. The Forest Service operates virtually as a subsidiary of the timber industry, and its job is to turn forests into tree farms for them. They will use any excuse, whether it’s the pine beetle or the need for housing, to do it- and at taxpayers' expense. They don’t care about wildlife and don’t want to set a precedent by giving in to public outcry."

In a highly-publicized civil disobedi- ence action on October 21 organized by Earth First, activists leaped onto the moving 52-ton crushing machine and also climbed trees in the machine’s path. Many chained themselves and were later arrested. Bugis Cargas of Austin re- mained chained to the machine over- night, since rangers were unable to find animal casualties. George Russell, who visits the site regularly, sees them circling particular areas for a week or more after the area has been crushed, indicating that many maimed and trapped animals are dying very slow deaths.

An October 21 Newsweek story on the issue prompted Texas Attorney General Jim Mattos to request a one-week moratorium on crushing while his office investigated the matter. Mattos filed suit against the USFS, seeking a temporary injunction to halt the operations. On November 18, U.S. District Judge Lynn N. Hughes refused to grant the Injunction. As we go to press, it is expected that a more extensive court hearing will take place sometime in December. Protesters have vowed to continue their efforts if the crushing and napalming are resumed. To date, opponents have been_preded extensive publicizing by environmental groups and a number of individual animal rights ac- tivists, although according to George Russell, environmentalists are pleading for help from animal protection organiza- tions. Concerned animal activists should let their Congresspersons know that the National Forest is not the only area to be amended to halt clear-cutting, because it malnourishes wildlife, and de- stroys habitats.

Activists should contact the Forest Ser- vice to protest the crushing and napalming operations; write to Max Peterson, Chief of Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 14th & Independence Ave., S.W., Room 3008-S, Washington D.C. 20250 or (202) 424-5371. Activists may contact Earth First at P.O. Box 7192, University Station, Austin, TX 78713; (512) 467-1848.
Britain’s New Law Termed “Vivisectors’ Charter”

The British Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act was given the Royal Assent in May, and has replaced the 180-year-old Cruelty to Animals Act as the main law controlling experiments on animals. The law, which (when fully operational for two years) will be the result of years of White Paper attacks initiated by Conservative MP David Mellor. The major changes in the law involve licensing, under the new Act, anyone performing an experiment on an animal was required to hold a license issued by the Secretary of State. In addition, the experiment facility was to be licensed. The new law requires that a project license can be obtained. A project license will be granted by the Secretary of State only if the experiment satisfies one or more of the following:

- the protection (whether by the testing of any product or otherwise), diagnosis, or treatment of disease, ill-health, or abnormality, or their effects, in humans, animals, or plants;
- the assessment, detection, regulation, or modification of physiological conditions in humans or animals;
- the protection of the natural environment in the interest of the health or welfare of humans or animals;
- the advancement of knowledge in biological or behavioural sciences;
- education or training other than in primary or secondary schools;
- forensic inquiries;
- the breeding of animals for experimental or other scientific uses.

In short, not a single experiment will be prohibited under the new law. The law makes it illegal to use animals who do not come from a registered breeding or supply establishment, apart from exceptions for farm animals and wild animals. The new law allows for animals to be used, but is to recover from one experiment to be used in another. This has been prohibited in the 186 Act. The new law also releases restrictions on the use of animals in practice surgery and education.

The Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act was supported by the British Veterinary Association (BVA), the Committee for the Reform of Animal Experimentation (CRAE), the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME), the Research Defense Society (the British counterpart of the U.S. Foundation for Biomedical Research), and various other pro-vivisection organizations. FRAME said that the Act represents the effective compromise between the welfare needs of animals... and the equal legitimate requirements of medicine, science, and commerce.

For Laboratory Animals, a coalition of leading British animal rights organizations (The British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, BUAV), Animal Aid, and the National and Scottish Anti-Vivisection Societies) bought the bill every step of the way. According to Mobilization, the Act "relaxes even further the spurious 'protection' afforded by the Cruelty to Animals Act 1876". Mobilization believes that the "present deplorable situation could have been improved by prohibiting certain types of experiments. They suggested an immediate ban on the LSO and Draize tests, toxic and tobacco, and alcohol research, psychological and behavioral experiments; and warfare experiments. Mobilization, like many American animal rights organization, has a complete lack of confidence in the abilities of monitoring agencies which inevitably have a vested interest in perpetuating animal experimentation. British groups opposed to the new law have termed it "the vivisectionists' charter".

The British law is not unlike the recently-revised Animal Welfare Act of the United States in many respects. The most notable similarity is that under both laws, experiments are left with virtually complete freedom in experimentation. However, because the U.S. allows for much greater public access to information, private citizens can monitor experiments in a way that is impossible in England. Despite great controversy and disappointment, animal activists are confident that it will not take another 100 years to change the law. As one activist put it, "The new law is already becoming outdated. The situation is changing so quickly, I would not be at all surprised if we have a law that really helps animals within five years' time."

-Lauri Gruen

Boston Activists Protest Circus

Those who attended the opening night of the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus in Boston found more activity than they had anticipated thanks to the efforts of the Coalition against Suffering and Exploitation (CEASE) — efforts which resulted in CEASE being taken to federal court.

Before entering the Boston Garden, where the circus was held, circus-goers were greeted by 30 CEASE members carrying signs and distributing leaflets explaining how circuses exploit animals. Several activists were dressed as clowns, and gave it and other activities, leaving it eagerly taken by patrons who thought the "clown" was part of the show. The audience was seated inside and awaiting the start of the show, it was presented with another message from CEASE. Just prior to the scheduled start of the performance, four ten-foot hammers were burned and attached to rails at the front of the balcony sections. They remained visible for 20 minutes while spectators from all parts of the arena could read "Don't Turn Animal Heads Into a Circus" and "The Greatest Show on Earth: Brought to You by Animal Suffering!" Agitated security crews eventually removed the banners, but the activists who displayed them followed two banners before leaving the building.

More problems were created for the circus, however, when a group of people, who had posted the "Circus Cancelled" signs, and the television station did not say that the additional al or other events were cancelled. NEARLY FROM CEASE, the complaint included the circus' prediction that "CEASE intends to continue to disrupt Circus performances by actually entering the performance area and unfurling banners and posters critical of Circus activities and by shouting statements and slogans of similar substance. Further, they believe that CEASE also intends to engage in "disinformation" tactics concerning Circus performances."

Since the circus sought to restrain CEASE from picketing or leafletting any- where on Boston Garden property (and that was in fact the only activity the group intended to "do"), a CEASE representative appeared in federal court to propose a compromise: the group would agree to do not to "do" anyway (disrupt performances or post "Circus Cancelled" signs), and in turn there would be no attempt to prevent picketing or leafletting, and after the cir-
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**Local public accountability in animal research**

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) announced a new initiative to increase public accountability in animal research. The initiative, called the Public Accountability in Laboratory Animal Research (Pals) program, aims to improve transparency and public trust in animal research. The program will involve a public advisory committee to review animal research proposals and ensure that they meet public accountability standards.

**Alligators at a privately-owned Florida zoo are being killed for meat and leather, according to a report by John Hall of the Orlando Sentinel. Until this past summer, the Gatorland Zoo in Orange County, Florida, kept its approximately 5,000 gators solely for entertainment purposes. However, with the rapidly increasing demand for alligator meat and leather, the zoo decided to follow what has become a state-wide trend by opening a slaughterhouse on its grounds. Now there are two classifications for alligators at the zoo: "show" alligators, who live in pools and perform in Gatorland's popular "Alligator Jumper" show and "meat" alligators, who live in glass pens and eat a special diet to fatten them up. Workers slay the gators with blows to the base of the skull which sever the spinal cord. Gatorland's gift shop sells alligator-hide attache cases, $300 boots, and $500 purses. Cats of "Gator Country" are also for sale. Alligator products are plans to open a "Gator Dell" featuring "meat" alligators, claiming that alligators are not afforded the same protection under the law as their wild counterparts. The owners of Gatorland, Frank and Caroline Stephenson, say they never receive any complaints from people who think the alligators should be killed. Alligators can write letters of protest to Frank Godwin, Owner, Gatorland Zoo, 14501 S. Orange Blossom Trail, Orlando, FL 32835, or call (305) 855-5490.**

**Reindeer suffer from Chernobyl fallout.**

The radioactive cloud spawned from the Chernobyl nuclear accident last April has had devastating effects on reindeer herds in Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Grant reindeer fed upon contaminated south-west and grasses, are suffering from clear rashes that fell in the central third of the herding region known as Lapland, which covers a vast northern area of the three countries. Radioactive Cesium-137, having initially settled on the surface grasses, was washed into the soil and taken up by the roots of plants in a man-made concentration. The affected region is inhabited by the indigenous Samen, a name preferred by some Lapps who wish to preserve a culture which has been dependent upon the reindeer for some 2,000 years. The reindeer are the chief food source and the basis for the economy of the Same.

**Animal rights activist Lynda Smith was recently vindicated in a court case brought against her by Joel and Sandy Widener, the late owner of the Crystal Club (NYKC) in South Wayne, New Jersey. Smith was charged by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation with interfering with the sale of poodles. The court agreed that Smith was entitled to recover the damages she suffered when she was prevented from purchasing the poodles in a local pet store.**

**A significant court victory for animals took place recently in Hillsborough County, Florida. After pursuing every other possibility to get the county to reverse a 26-year-old policy of selling pound animals to researchers, USF officials had claimed that the power to allow pound seizure was implied in a clause which stipulated "human dispos-**
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MAKING THE DIFFERENCE:

Activity vs. Productivity: Strategies of Social Protest

BY HENRY SPIRA

As animal rights activists, we need to be aware of and deal with the public’s misconception of farm animals. Indeed, the majority of the public is strongly opposed to animal suffering, yet, that same majority eats animals and supports the use of animals in research—if they believe that there are human benefits and no "unnecessary" cruelty involved. At the same time, the animal protection movement wastes much energy in random activities, and often fails to recognize opportunities for public support.

In the past decade, there have been highly visible, symbolic campaigns on very few issues. Unfortunately, some of these campaigns have, at times, become enmeshed in themselves rather than integral parts of long-range strategic planning. More unfortunately, huge numbers of people get involved in projects that focus on very few animals, resulting in enormous activity but minimal productivity. There's a need to find focal points personal enough for the public to relate to, yet with enough ripple effects to have an impact on the larger picture of animal suffering.

The understandable outrage focusing specifically on isolated instances—often expressions of all-or-nothing (angels vs. devils) morality—has not been strategically effective for the complexity of the social issues involved. This is particularly true in instances where the research can be positioned (by the opposition) as necessary for humans.

In order to avoid such futility, we have sought "winnable" issues whose apparent irrationality would be difficult to defend (i.e., freezing lye, ammonia, oven cleaners, etc., into the eyes of rabbits in the Draize eye irritancy test) issues which would cause the general public to demand different behavior once they saw the irrationality of what was being done to animals and the possibility of alternatives. We have chosen targets so that each success produced widening public acceptance and scientific collaboration—part of a growing cascade of secure victories that could most rapidly lead to the largest amount of relief for the suffering animals. These efforts can be seen as part of an attempt to establish "zero-based" use of animals in every sphere through constant questioning: Is this data necessary? Can the data be obtained without animals or with fewer animals or with less pain?

In sum, transformation is gradual. If you want people and institutions to change, the pressure for such change must be strategically focused—without losing sight of the ultimate goal: to create a society where we live in harmony with one another—with human and nonhuman animals, and with all of nature.

What can the individual do now?

As consumers, write, phone, or visit companies whose products you use. Let them know of your concerns, and ask them (1) publicly commit themselves to eliminate the use of live animals in product development and testing; and (2) let you know how they'll achieve their goals and within what time frames.

The long-range need is to sensitize a new generation to the fact that animals feel pain, and that, therefore, they have an obligation to see to it that animals are not harmed. Support to school principals, science teachers, PTA groups which feel that inflicting pain upon defenseless, innocent creatures cannot be considered a worthwhile classroom activity. Promote alternatives such as vinyl models, transparent overlays, and computer programs (check school biological supply catalogs for detailed information).

Four billion animals suffer from birth to death on factory farms every year. Demand the right to non-violent meals in public cafeterias from grade school through universities. Such campaigns can be mounted by tax-payers, parents, or students, and they provide an opportunity for focusing on the routine and institutionalized violence inflicted on farm animals.

What can animal protection organizations do?

They can provide grassroots activists with basic effective tools to promote change. For example, The American Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, The Humane Society of the United States, and The Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals are preparing a campaign to abolish the crating of calves by the real industry. When all the pieces are in place, grassroots activists will have tools with which to spotlight the most elementary right of every animal—the right to be able to move their bodies—right now denied to the "dead" calf who cannot even turn around comfortably.

In promoting alternatives to animals in research and testing, major groups could fund appropriate and prestigious think tanks or universities to develop position papers highlighting opportunities for reducing and replacing the use of animals, including regulatory practices, behavioral and military experiments, the teaching of biology, product development, and safety testing. Such "white papers" are needed for strategic planning and to help writers, activists, and lobbyists increase the effectiveness of their campaigns.

Henry Spira is founder of the Coalition to Abolish LD50 and Diane Tests and the new Coalition for Non-Violent Food.
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HIDDEN CRIMES

THE FIRST FILM EVER TO PROVE THAT WE ARE ALL VICTIMS OF THE FRAUD OF ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

THE FILM THAT WILL BRING ABOUT THE TOTAL ABOLITION OF VIVISECTION!!

• The breath-taking film that offers a glimpse into a world you weren't meant to see: the hidden world of animal experimentation where grant-hungry pseudo-scientists are responsible not only for the torture of millions of animals but also for the systematic destruction of our health and collapse of our world!

• The 78 minute fact-filled film you must see before you take any more over-the-counter or prescription drugs, allow your children to be vaccinated or agree to undergo surgery or any other medical procedure. This film can save your life!!

• "Hidden Crimes" includes the shocking footage that the Animal Liberation Front secretly took at the City of Hope, the University of California at Riverside and at the University of Pennsylvania. See what the media won't show you!!!

• "Hidden Crimes" cuts through the lies of the researchers and the mumbi jumbo of those in the movement who mistakenly advocate the "reaganization" or "reform" of vivisection or the "eventual abolition" on moral and ethical grounds only.

• "Hidden Crimes" constitutes an indispensable and most powerful tool for the true anti-vivisectionist anywhere interested in giving the facts straight to the people of the world.

• "Hidden Crimes" is also available in Europe (PAL System) through CIVIS, Talier 40, Ch-7250, Klosters Switzerland. It was written, produced and directed by Jever Burgus for SUPPRESS. It was financed with the donations of SUPPRESS members and friends.

WARNING: This film may be hazardous to those who won't face reality.

Send $25.00 dollars (postage included) for your VHS or Beta copy (California residents add $1.00 sales tax). Visa/Transcript available for $6.00 each.

Mail to: SUPPRESS
50 E. Colorado Blvd., Suite 6
Pasadena, CA 91101
(818) 586-0446

+ *ADVERTISEMENT*

Had Enough?

The front lines at some of the most notorious labs and universities across the country in demonstrations to stop animal pain and suffering that can't ... and won't be ignored. So please, call me at (415) 924-4454 or send the form below ... right now. Because the animals need your help ... and we need your help.

- Ellior M. Katz D.V.M., President

In Defense of Animals

Dear Dr. Katz:

☐ Please tell me how and where I can participate in the April 24th Actions.

☐ I can't personally participate; here's my tax-deductible donation to help you help the animals:

$15 $25 $35 $50 Other

Name

Address

City

State ZIP

Please mail this coupon to: In Defense of Animals

21 Tamal Vista Blvd., Corte Madera, CA 94925
What Can We Expect From Pet Food Companies?

BY JOHN F. KULLBERG

Humane society adoption programs that now receive grants from pet food companies are expected to give evidence of increased numbers of healthy and adoptable cats and dogs. However, not fewer—because pet feeding is not a consumer-oriented activity. Pet feeding is not a consumer-oriented activity. Pet feeding is not a consumer-oriented activity.

writing this deficit—For New York City alone! The ASPCA knows that what the ASPCA simply provides are far from adequate. Providing even close to adequate services would mean something like a $5 million deficit next year, with a similar amount needed to purchase additional shelters and veterinary supplies, and to purchase ambulances. And New York City is but one example of a growing national problem.

What we have to fight, then, is the mentality that supports "mass production" of animals, the merchandising of their desirability, and the dramatization of their importance to human physical and psychological well-being. Pet marketing (including that practiced by many humane societies) fosters the concept of "ownership", and glorifies the role of "master." Considering this superficial marketing mentality it should come as no surprise to discover that, by the millions, pets are discarded in a fashion resembling the material "throw-away" items that permeate the marketplace. There is no question that these marketing efforts have contributed greatly to turning pets into commodities. We need not reject offers of assistance from the industry, though—however support the motivations. Efforts by pet food companies to promote proper pet care, for example, (including spaying and neutering) should be strongly encouraged. Sample precedent for this already exists in pet service campaigns orchestrated by liquor companies which underscore the need to avoid problems associated with their products (e.g., "Make That One for the Road Cof- fee"). Any dissemination of information by pet food companies that reminds the public of inhumane stewardship responsibilities is needed, whether the information is on the products themselves, in ads or in public service announcements.

But product-related advocacy that includes guidelines for more "responsible" human behavior is not enough. And yet, pet feeding in the industry we voluntarily do more. There may be ways, however, to have the industry undertake (not indirectly) substantial programs to benefit companion animals. I am enthusiastic about the possibilities that exist for tapping what will soon be an annual $8 billion market to persuade federal government and individual states apply a wholesale tax now to gasoline, cigarettes, and alcohol. We even tax dogs through city dog licensing programs. So why not tax pet foods? Think about it: a five per cent tax on cat food (cat food currently sells in my area for less than 35 cents a can) would increase the cost by less than two cents per can. I would certainly pay a metal label on the wholesale price. my guess is that a five per cent wholesale pet food tax would impact very little on the retail cost—pet food industry protests to the contrary.

A five per cent wholesale tax on pets could raise $30 million annually for renewed animal overpopulation initiatives. A lot of good could be done for America's un- wanted animals with that kind of annual windfall, both for new and expanded efforts aimed at the control of animal overpopulation: lack of knowledge, unavailability of low-cost contraceptives, and the stigma of law enforcement. Cities could also adequately address the overwhelming expensive consequences of dog and cat over- population with modern, clean animal shelters, responsi- ble and accessible adoption programs, and, when necessary, truly humane euthanasia procedures.

The tax and distribution model I envision would have the state collect the tax (a rather simple process given the large numbers of such payments to localities), distribute these monies to local municipalities based on known companion animal populations. Municipalities, in turn, would contract with humane societies for these programs the municipal- ities choose not to undertake themselves.

The alternative, however, is to ask the federal government, major cities and other major American cities will be even fewer humanely operated animal control services as costs continue to rise, and existing income sources continue to be scoured for attention to overpopulation causes is inevitable, and the present trend of increasinganimal overpopulation will continue. The result will be a wave of severe economic challenges for us and for the communities, cities and states that we serve.

Legislative efforts to tax pet foods and even pet supplies are underway in several cities throughout the coun- try. I believe that such tax efforts might be a useful way that we face formidable opponents to the concept—not only the large pet food companies but also the companies fearful of the implications of additional excise tax prece- dents. As America's federal deficit grows, and states (already a matter of less and less concern to us) find they are reaching taxpayer tolerance limits for financing human social programs, the pressure for federal excise taxes next year for animal control programs. The sooner we establish a reliable income source to support efforts at combating the tragedy of animal overpopulation, the sooner meaningful inroads can be made towards ending America's annual car- nage of ten million or more "surplus" dogs and cats who, ironically, meet their sad fate partially as a result of the pet food industry's increasingly successful "pet marketing" strategy.

John F. Kullberg is president of The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals headquartered in New York City. The ASPCA is the nation's oldest animal protection organization.
Movement-wide Unity Tops Readers’ Concerns

BY DOUG MOSS

Certainly not an unfamiliar concept (at least not in these pages), unity topped the list of concerns of animal activists responding to our latest reader poll on issues, tactics and priorities. “Like the NRA (National Rifle Association)” added one respondent. Large wealthy organizations, however, were by no means singled out in this area (though they were in others). Much concern was expressed about grassroots groups who now seem to be finding themselves in the bonus of the same kinds of in-fighting and competitiveness that sent them away from some of the older organizations less than a decade ago.

The movement would be more effective if...

Along with the strong demand for more unity came concerns for more flexible and tolerant leadership, and plans for leaders and rank-and-file activists to welcome people at varying degrees of commitment, perhaps “not as pure” as they. And though some movement participants appear “burned-out” on conferences and the like, there seems to be a desire on the part of many new readers for information and instructional workshops on issues and strategies. Many would like to see more people assuming local leadership (which translates into “more decentralized, grassroots activity”), and certainly the development of better informed, strategy-minded individuals would be a prerequisite to this.

“Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink”

Recent concerns raised about the finances of animal groups have generated much interest in “idle funds” and ways to make the best use of the animal rights dollar. High on the list of proposed expenditures was advertising, with kudos to those organizations who have recently run ad campaigns against fur and cosmetics testing. Concerns about large fund balances (and the sources of those funds) as raised in 1985’s Mobilization for Animals’ report have apparently generated demands that are simply not going to go away until tangibly addressed in the form of aid to smaller, struggling organizations and/or concrete programs (i.e., advertising) to accelerate the dissemination of animal rights ideas among the general public.

Readers were especially interested in concrete, winnable goals, understanding the need for compromise in reaching those goals, and building coalitions (back to the “unity” idea again). Some specific suggestions included making better use of media (television and billboard advertising in particular), and building alliances with the peace movement and the new breed of more radical (“deep ecology”) groups who seem more likely to embrace animal issues in their agendas than some other movements. Other suggested strategies included “tying animal research and food animal issues in with public health,” reaching veterinarians as a professional group with the potential to help carry the animal rights message.

As usual, Animal Liberation Front (ALF) actions, particularly the lab break-in associated with one of the most visible animal rights issues in recent years—the University of Pennsylvania’s head-injury lab controversy—were the most highly-lauded as enhancing awareness about animal rights. Yet, the movement is somewhat divided on how it views the ALF (i.e., “do its actions constitute violence?”). Despite all this, the ALF (please don’t stand up, whoever you are) will probably be viewed in a better light 50 years from now, when all the “bad press” is long forgotten.
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Pet Theft Rings

Countering the threat of cat and dognapping in your neighborhood may require the adoption of new household rules.

BY MEGAN MURPHY-HAMILTON

Katharine Peake never saw their cats again. It is possible that Bruiser and Chuckie wandered off, but Mrs. Peake discovered a strange coincidence. People began calling her, to discuss their missing cats. In the neighborhood, an area six blocks long, thirteen other cats disappeared at the same time Bruiser and Chuckie did. All of the missing cats lived in corner or next-to-corner houses.

Was it possible that the cats had been stolen? Pet theft is a profitable business. Each year, according to Mary Warner, founder of "Action-81," a nationwide organization dedicated to helping in the recovery of stolen pets, more than 1.5 million dogs and cats are stolen out of their own homes and yards. Warner knows about pet theft from experience as her own German Shepherd was stolen from her backyard. Warner organized "Action-81" in 1979 because she became angry after reading an article in a local paper describing a truckload of dogs who belonged to a Pennsylvania dealer; the dogs were all from Virginia. Warner believes that pet theft is a profitable business. Pet thieves often sell their unfortunate cargo to dealers who are licensed to operate by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Dealers will pay between $20 and $400 for dogs and $5 to $15 for cats, and then resell them to research facilities for as much as $200 per dog and $150 per cat. Dealers' clientele may also include the fur industry, guard dogs, schools, puppy farms, and dog fighters.

Some pet thieves sell animals to Mexico and Canada. Mexican dealers prize dog and cat meat; therefore, the pet thief may sell animal's pet to Canada and the meat to Mexico. Canadian furriers will pay as much as $12.00 for a cat skin. The most popular colors are: tortoiseshell, calico, white, black, Siamese, and pinto (black and white). Fortunates also include long-haired cats. The skins are dyed to resemble rabbit, mink or other types of popular fur. Deboraman coats are very fashionable in Paris. Fudgie skins were found on drying racks in west Virginia; and cats have been killed for their fur in California and Nebraska. Husky dogs are often killed to make "wolf" coats.

Dog fighting is another profitable outlet for thieves and dealers. Pit bulls are the most popular breed in this vicious "sport." Cats, rabbits and small dogs are often used as "bait" in pit bull training. So are placid dogs, such as golden retrievers. One popular and sickening tactic employed by dog fighters is to stuff a declining cat into a sack, leaving the head and feet exposed. Next, the cat is suspended by the tail and the pit bull lunges and when the cat is mauled badly enough, the dog is allowed to make the kill. In a booklet entitled "The War Against Dog Fighting: A Regional Proposal," Richard Avanzino, President of the San Francisco SPCA, describes the horrifying abuses that occur in the "training" process. "A single fighting dog may kill as many as 50 animals during a year by scaring, biting, and chasing, before it ever enters a ring. As the dog is taught to become a killer, the animals that are sacrificed do not die gently. It is believed that many of the helpless creatures used in the "blooding" process were former pets." (Many humane organizations offer rewards for information about dog fighting activities.) If you're the guardian of one or more of America's 50 million cats and 48 million dogs, find out how they receive and take steps to protect your animal friends.

Most common methods used to steal pets:

1. Using lures: A female dog in "heat" is paraded down a street. This tactic attracts all the unaltered male dogs in the neighborhood. Drugged meat loaded with sedatives is another common lure. The pet snapper tosses the meat over a fence and waits quietly for the dog to eat it. A thief who spots a dog wandering the street will often drop the meat at the animal's feet. Sometimes a particularly brazen thief just opens the back door of his car and places a tempting dish of food on the seat. Dogs who are too trusting jump in.

2. Butterfly or swimming pool arts: This is the most popular method for catching cats. A cloth is usually stretched into the side of the net, so that the cat's cries can be muffled. Three high school boys from Augusta County, Virginia, went on a two-night furay, capturing fifty cats. They sold the cats for $10.00 apiece to the University of Virginia and earned $500.00. The Federal Animal Welfare Act, established in 1956, prohibits research facilities from buying animals from any source other than licensed dealers and municipal pounds, and the USDA is supposed to enforce the law. But according to Debbie Diemeier, former Executive Director of the Rockingham County SPCA, in an article that appeared in the Newport, Virginia News, the USDA told the University not to worry about the Act. "The University adopted the policy "This is to say, we do not have to worry about the Act," she said.

3. Phony officials: One man in Roanoke, Virginia impersonated a dogcatcher by wearing a green uniform nearly identical to the ones worn by animal control officers. He drove a pickup equipped with a dog cage in the back. The "catcher," in fact, was the owner trying to produce the dog's license, if the owner couldn't, he would "confiscate" the animal. Often, if the owner did produce a license, the dog would disappear. The SPCA has gone to court on this issue.

4. Breaking and entering. A petnapper will often scout a neighborhood, watching houses to see if any animals are inside. If he spots a dog or cat looking out a window, he will wait until the owners are gone, then break in and steal the pet. One recent case in St. Louis, Missouri, had his peke-a-poo stolen in a house. Fortunately, a small dog was located at Fort Lee, Virginia, and with the help of Action-81, the Humane Society officials, shipped back home to its thankful owner.

The best ways to protect your pet:

1. Tattituing: A tattoo makes your pet easier to identify if lost. You can have your name, address and phone number tattooed on the animal. A tattoo is extremely difficult to remove—unless a name tag or collar. If you decide to have your pet tattooed, have it done on the animal's belly or flank. It's too easy for a third or dealer to cut off an ear, tail or paw.

2. Do not leave your dog unsupervised in the yard. When you leave the house, keep the dog inside. Remember, pet thieves often do their dirty work when they know the owner has left. Chaining a dog in the front or back yard is not a good idea because the dog is then a helpless, "sitting duck," who can easily be stolen. If your dog is large and needs outdoor space, keep him in a well-secured dog run.

3. If you have cats, keep them in the house. Cats are travellers and can easily be stolen or trapped. Watch the consequences: you may believe that cats should be allowed to roam outside, but consider that your cat companion may someday be used as "bait" for a pitbull or as the "mink" in a fur coat.


5. Never offer an animal "free to a good home." A favorite tactic used by many pet thieves is to respond to such an offer by sending a child or pleasant-looking elderly couple to take the animal and give it a "good home."
Cocaine Trade Analogous to Fur

The speciousness of Al Henricov's arguments for the fur industry (Letters, November '86), which center around the buzzwords "cultural genocide" with its superior racism, "tradition" and even the "survival of wildlife" (?), comes easily into focus by comparing it to the fur trade with the drug trade. Henricov's claim of cultural and economic dependence of some native nations on the trapping of reproducing animals can with even greater plausibility be made for the various indigenious populations around the world whose sole income derives from the growing of drug-producing plants. Indeed, at this time, the entire economy of Bolivia, for instance, is based on the harvesting (and sale of coca plants are being applied. Applying Henricov's logic, it's factual that the promotion of drug dealing (analogous to the fur trade) is an absolute necessity for the well-being of such native peoples, and hence also environmentally sound for the local flora. Hence, attempts to curb drug abuse and the drying up of inebriant should be the highest (and sale) of coca plants be stopped.

Applying Henricov's logic, it's factual that the promotion of drug dealing (analogous to the fur trade) is an absolute necessity for the well-being of such native peoples, and hence also environmentally sound for the local flora. Hence, attempts to curb drug abuse and the drying up of inebriant should be the highest (and sale) of coca plants be stopped.

A Point Well Taken

"Lieutenent Your Language." (October '86) was an interesting article. Many examples were given of contemporary and important, however, left out was one term that we all are guilty of perpetuating: "laytonary animal." The use of this term renders the industry and the supporters of animal rights as justifying the treatment of the animal. The word "animal" has been used in animal rights movements to describe the treatment of non-human beings. It is time to reconsider the use of this term.

Kevin Duran
Los Angeles, CA

Check Out Environmental Education

October's ANIMALS' AGENDA asked advisor Farley Mowat for advice for those seeking employment incorporating an interest in animals and the environment. I suggest an alternative to the "wildlife management" of the "field of "wildlife management" proposed by Mr. Mowat? the concept of environmental education. Along with low pay and a negative lifestyle, does offer some spiritually rewarding moments. Environmental education utilizes the cut-out doors to cultivate a sense of responsibility for the world. By doing so, we can create a new generation of animal lovers who will continue to fight for the preservation of our natural world.

Deirdre Primack
Animals in Politics
P.O. Box 1280
New York, NY 10013
Atoning for Ahab

Strandings—Ways to Save Whales
A Humane Conservationist’s Guide

By Frank D. Robson
The Science Press, 1984
124 pages, profusely illustrated, $16.00, cloth
Order directly from: Cetacean Society International, c/o William Rosater,
21 Laurel Hill Road, Ridgefield, CT 06877.

The "mass suicide" of whales and dolphins has long baffled observers. What is it that compels two of the earth’s most intelligent species to commit, from time to time, apparently irrational acts of self-destruction? How can entire herds suddenly lose their innate navigational and survival instincts to die a lingering death on the beach?

As Frank Robson points out in this extraordinary book (actually a detailed, hands-on manual for rescuing cetaceans), strandings incidents have a lot more to do with the simple facts of old age and infirmity, and the strong loyalties that bind these animals, than with any spell of irrationality. Indeed, Robson’s poignant observations offer conclusive evidence that cetaceans are, at the very least, another species on this planet—besides our own—fully capable of deliberate altruism.

Frank Robson is not a marine biologist by academic training, but, at 78, he brings impeccable credentials to the job. A New Zealander who at one time earned his livelihood as a fisherman, he has spent most of his life close to the sea and its creatures.

In his mid-fifties, deeply moved by the tragedy of whale strandings, Robson embarked on a personal search for answers. He devoted the next 16 years to intensive observations of all sorts of strandings and pre-stranding, behavior.

Some readers will be surprised to discover that strandings and strandings are not identical. A grounding occurs when a whale (or whales) swimming shoreward encounters water too shallow for effective buoyancy. Unable to go on any further, the animal rolls over to one side parallel to the beach, and becomes to the incoming waves. As long as the whale continues to be surrounded by water, she is only "grounded." However, should the receding waters leave a whale "high and dry" at the high tide mark, the whale is then classified as "stranded." The animal is then also in imminent danger.

A crucial rule that "sponsors" (an human cetacean helpers are called) must invariably honor is to immediately contact other people, especially the police, when a stranding is anticipated or in progress. The police, argues Robson, may play a crucial role because of their broad community contacts and technical resources. Only after this is done should the sponsors attempt to rescue the stranded animals themselves.

Another misconception laid to rest by Robson is that stranded whales are "committing suicide." In herd strandings the whales are almost always in good physical shape and, if possible, they will extricate themselves from their predicament, swim off, rejoin the herd and resume their life at sea. But for this to happen, the animals must first regain their equilibrium, as severe loss of balance occurs when whales in difficulties lie on one side for an extended period. If balance is not fully restored, the whales will become grounded again and again. (Fortunately, in most cases this problem can be avoided through simple corrective procedures fully spelled out in the book.) Incidentally, despite outward appearances, whales do not fight at any time during a grounding incident. The vigorous tail-thrashing, frequently observed during these events is only an attempt by the animals to "pump" their own bodies and those of their herd mates while water is still available. This helps them keep cool and prevents sunburn. And the thrashing may also be an effort to regain their natural upright swimming posture.

Robson is especially emphatic about the fact that if whales do not strafe on masses! Whales do not rush adroitly together to throw themselves on the beach. What really happens is a gradual process following the grounding of a lone or "key" whale, an animal who, for variety of reasons, has become detached from the herd and swim shoreward in an extreme or absent-minded state. Often, as the "key" whale lies in the shallows on his

Ignorance is not bliss.

Winter is here and once again a profusion of wildlife has appeared in our cities. Unfortunately, most of that wildlife is dead and is making its appearance on the backs of men and women who think fur is fashionable. When asked how they can justify wearing a fur, most of these people have ready rationalizations: "There’s nothing warmer or longer lasting," "Fur is a renewable resource," and, of course, "The animals were raised for their fur." It’s frustrating to see all those people wearing fur each year, ignorant of the cost to the animals.

The tragic fact is that furs are synonymous with animal pain and suffering. An estimated 50 million animals are used for their fur each year in the United States alone. Many of these animals spend their short lives on fur ranches" where they are confined in small wire cages, deprived of any chance to exercise or engage in normal behaviors and killed by suffocation, electrocution or other inhumane methods. Animals trapped in the wild don’t fare any better. An animal caught in a steel-jaw leghold trap may wait days without food, water or protection from predators, until its life is brutally ended by the trap. Those animals that escape—often by wringing off the trapped paw—usually succumb to a painful death from gangrene, infection or loss of blood.

The ASPCA is combating the wearing of fur through programs designed to increase the awareness of potential fur buyers. We’re involved with the Committee Against Furs, a coalition of humane groups, and have helped organize anti-fur demonstrations. But to get the message across to as many people as possible, we need your help.

What can you do?
• Express your opposition to furs by wearing our colorful Ban Fur button (or order, use the coupon at right).
• Send for a copy of our latest flyer, Fur Facts and Fallacies, which explores some common misconceptions about furs and trapping. Disturb all street fairs or send them to your fur-wearing acquaintances!

ASPCA
The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
America’s First Humane Society
Breakout at the Zoo

Turtle Diary


Turtle Diary, starring Glenda Jackson and Ben Kingsley, is a film about animal liberation. Ably directed by John Irvin, the plot manages to get all the way out of a cramped tank in an urban zoo. The film is about turtle keepers. A van. And a very cool head: "When the keepers are excited, they can talk to each other and not be heard."

Jackson, a writer of children’s books about animals, and Ben Kingsley, a clerk in a bookshop, see each other casually but not frequently at the aquarium. They are both interested to the realization that the turtles they love are not free in the aquarium and Kingsley meets another turtle, a very cool head, who also enjoys the same freedom. They want to set the turtles free and decide to make the boundary of the aquarium not a barrier but an opportunity for them.

"What would we need to make our dream real?" asks the turtle character. Kingsley replies, "Three things: The cooperation of the turtle keeper. A van. And a very cool head." When the keepers are excited, they can talk to each other and not be heard.

As could be expected, the drive to the ocean affords the usual moments fraught with tension. Will they make it? A curious group of animal-lovers, watching the turtle as they will at least have a head start toward a new world, tropical home.

The improbable heroes, of course, manage to keep their cool, eventually arriving at the chosen beach, where in a touching poignant scene, the two new turtle friends and their human companions cut their ties with the human world and set sail on a journey of freedom.

Not only does the film convey a powerful message of the importance of animal liberation, but it also highlights the bond between humans and animals, emphasizing the need for compassion and respect for all living beings. The story is a testament to the power of collective action and the importance of standing up for what we believe in, even in the face of adversity.

—Betsy Stuart

Cetaceans, like other nonhuman animals, seem to accept death due to old age calmly. When they have lost their strength and ability to swim or surf for air, they will return again and again to the beach, regardless of what treatment they receive on land. The main reason, according to Rosbran, these whales (who may act as "key" whales and precipitate a full-scale stranding) are beyond help and should be promptly and humanely put to death.

Rosbran is uncomfortable making this suggestion (there may be laws, also, that don’t allow the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act, which block this course of action), but his experience has taught him the hard way that sentiment at the wrong time may cost more lives than necessary. The would-be Samurai is confronted here with some very tough choices. What is one to make, for example, of a stranded situation involving a cow, a calf, and an accompanying adult? Surely.

When the mother is aged and dying, but found to be still lactating, both cow and calf must be put to death as soon as possible. In such a case the accompanying adult, a healthy calf, will, re-pose to balance starvation treatment and will leave the area when pushed into deeper water. She will leave only when there are no longer any distress signals being emitted from the beached mother and calf.

Obviously, such a drastic option may be skipped if the calf appears to have been weaned, in which case, after the cow is mercifully dispatched, the baby and the accompanying calf can be encouraged to swim out to sea and safety. But, insists Rosbran, "while the mother is alive on the beach, rescue efforts will be fruitless because the calf, hearing his mother’s distress calls, will continually return to her. And the accompanying adult will not desert the calf. All three will be lost."

Such are some of the more depressing aspects of cetacean assistance and rescue operations. Yet this book is also rich in the description of proven assistance procedures, and therefore hope. The essential assistance routines are not difficult to memorize: (1) Police must be advised of the grounding/stranding at once; (2) the whales must be kept wet throughout the procedure; (3) they must be rolled and gently curved; (4) curving of the spine must be avoided; (5) rounds or channels must be dug to accommodate the dorsal fins, and flukes are rolled over; (6) rollers must be kept close to the body; (7) the whales must be allowed time to rest and would not be allowed to be blown or otherwise obstructed; (8) blow holes may be sealed; and (9) the whale must never be allowed to lie upside down.

When finally in sufficiently deep water, all animals must be encouraged to swim away, but if they fail to maintain their balance they must be helped again through a rocking procedure fully outlined in the text.

Would-be saviors need not be put off by the apparent complexities implied by these procedures. The manual has anticipated most typical problems and doubts encountered by the neophyte, and a profusion of photographs and diagrams make clear the steps that should be followed, just about every relevant aspect of cetacean rescue is carefully laid out in this book, from preventive and rescue operations to the various kinds of stranded animals, for example the right whale, the humpback, and the dolphins. It would be a shame if you read this book and never took part in a rescue, as just the experience of participating in one can be a true joy.

—R. Grenville
we have not seen before, so we are making progress. Yes, 1986 was a good year for animal rights, as the opposition stiffness, we will have to work harder for every victory, no matter how small. The only thing, I think, is numbers. We must increase our outreach, be more consistent with our message, and come together with other movements such as the peace movement and the radical environmentalists, for our final goals are one and the same.

How do you suggest we approach the issues with the press? A recent term, "press" translates into "public", those that we are trying to reach.

It is my belief that we need to become more sophisticated, from a public relations point of view, in order to combat the constant spew spewed forth by our opponents. We must present a confident and aggressive stance without appearing hostile.

Was 1986 a good year for animal rights? More and more often the animal rights movement is perceived by the media as a powerful force for change. While I am pleased to note these comments, I cannot believe them. We are a dedicated lot who may be doomed to long-term disappointment even while internally bolstered by the knowledge that we are striving for peace for all life forms. We are, at best, only a bumbling force; we are growing in sophistication and we’ve got our opposition geared up for battle in a way

**INTERVIEW**

Don Barnes

Continued from page 5

**BLACKLISTED NEWS**

**BOARDING**

HARMONY KENNELS Vacaville, Boarding, day care and doggie day care. by appointment only. (707) 448-4564

**MERCHANDISE**

NATURE BASICS mail order catalog for people who love creatures great and small. Has quality products, not painlessly humorously tested on animals. Natural, environmentally safe, hypoallergenic, complete bodycare, cosmetics, household cleaning and products for animals. Catalog $1. Applies toward purchase. Write: Nature Basics, 61 Main Street, Lakeport, CA 95453.

**CLASSIFIED**

**CATALOGUED AD**

**Ord (for Low Price for List): KSO**

**DOM DOUGERS:** We have top quality printed and embossed business cards. Send 50 CENTS (REFUNDABLE WITH ORDER) to: EKORN AND MATE, Box 2842-A, Seattle, WA 98118.

**OPPOSED TO ANIMAL SUFFERING?** This ad is for your Large selection of pet food, cosmetics, household cleaners & toiletries. No animal ingredients (lamb, beef, or any other natural ingredients). Send for free brochure: Sunrise Lane, Dept D1, 798 Greenwood St, NY 10014.

**PET MEAL**

VEGETARIAN PET FOOD. Canines are carnivores, they are omnivorous. This high quality vegetable protein diet is a HEALTHY ALTERNATIVE TOWARDS A CRUELTY FREE WORLD." Other health foods available. "Natures Nutrition" 2871 Pacifica Blvd, Camarillo, CA 93010.

**CRUELTY-Free VEGAN HOME and personal care products. Mail order. Free catalog. Human Alternatives Prod. 8 Hamilton Street, Camdenton, MO 65020.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

CLIMBING BOOTS NEEDED by brised tree surgeon. NO LEATHER! Any suggestions? Josie, Box 434, Bar Harbor, Maine 04609.

**RIGN THE GREAT WHALES ARE FIGHTING FOR THEIR LIVES. S.O.N. sea Shepherd, Box 360, Redlands CA 92373 (213) 368-8300.

I have developed a 30% nutritious meatless dry dog food that tastes good, and doesn’t re- quire refrigeration. NUTS AND NETS NEEDED for start-up capital. Write to Con-Cat, P.O. Box 54, Myrtle Point, OR 97458. No one will call unless requested.

LOVING, KIND, RESPONSIBLE PEOPLE NEEDED to adopt one animal or two male dogs, overweight, obedience trained, healthy, friendly, intelligent house dogs, mature, socialized, neutered, castrated in a conventional spaying, spaying not an option. Personal setting and home of better affection unusual compassion. Please help: (502)312-4877 nights and weekends.
COUNTRY JOE MCDONALD
HOME: Berkeley, California
AGE: 44
PROFESSION: Singer, songwriter, record company and publishing company owner.
MOST MEMORABLE BOOK: Animal Factories, by Jim Mason and Peter Singer.
HOBBIES: Military history and social activism.
LAST ACCOMPLISHMENT: “Animal Tracks,” a record album of all animal and ecological songs on his own RAG BABY RECORDS.
QUOTE: “The animal movement, in order to succeed and be effective, must be bold, well thought-out, unsentimental, politically alert, radical in morality and scientific in methods.”
MAGAZINE: The ANIMALS’ AGENDA.

THE ANIMALS’ AGENDA—Your best connection with others who share your strongest feelings about animals, and with the people and groups who are making animal rights one of the major social movements of the 20th century. 10 times a year $18.00

The ANIMALS’ AGENDA
P.O. Box 5234, Westport, CT 06881